arXiv:1612.06520v2 [math.AG] 1 Jan 2017

ON THE PROJECTIVE NORMALITY OF CYCLIC COVERINGS OVER A RATIONAL SURFACE

LEI SONG

Abstract. Let S be a rational surface with $\dim|-K_S| \geq 1$ and let $\pi : X \to S$ be a ramified cyclic covering from a smooth surface X with the Kodaira dimension $\kappa(X) \geq 0$. We prove that for any integer $k \geq 3$ and ample divisor A on S, the adjoint divisor $K_X + k\pi^*A$ is very ample and normally generated. Similar result holds for minimal (possibly singular) coverings.

1. Introduction

Given a complex projective variety X and a base point free line bundle L on X, L is called *normally generated* if the natural map

$$H^0(X, L) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} H^0(X, L^{\otimes i}) \to H^0(X, L^{\otimes(i+1)})$$

surjects for all $i > 0$. A Cartier divisor D is *normally generated* if the associated line bundle $\mathscr{O}_X(D)$ is base point free and normally generated. If L is very ample and normally generated, then X is embedded by the complete linear system $|L|$ as a projectively normal variety. The concept of normal generation was introduced by Mumford in [Mum70].

A classical theorem of Castelnuovo, Mattuck, and Mumford says that on a smooth curve of genus g, any line bundle with degree at least $2g + 1$ is normally generated. Also by the work of Reider [Rei88], it is well known that for a smooth projective surface X and an ample divisor A, the adjoint divisor K_X+rA is very ample provided $r \geq 4$. These considerations naturally lead to the conjecture, commonly attributed to S. Mukai.

Conjecture 1.1. Let X be a smooth projective surface and A an ample divisor on X. Then for every integer $k \geq 4$, $K_X + kA$ is normally generated.

The conjecture is true in many cases, but open in general, especially for non-minimal surfaces and surfaces of general type.

In [RS17], we confirm the conjecture in case X is a minimal double covering over a rational surface S with $\dim|-K_S| \geq 1$ and A is the pullback

Key words and phrases. projective normality, adjoint divisor, cyclic covering, rational surface.

of an ample divisor on S. The main motivating examples are Horikawa surfaces, that are the minimal surfaces of general type with $K_X^2 = 2p_g - 4$. By [Hor76], if X is of this type, then either X or its canonical model (with mild singularities) can be realized as a double covering over $\mathbb{P}^2$ or some rational ruled surface $\mathbb{F}_e$. All the base surfaces in this setting are rational and have $\dim|-K_S| \geq 1$.

The purpose of this paper is to extend the results in [RS17] to arbitrary ramified cyclic coverings over a rational surface with $\dim|-K_S| \geq 1$. In particular, we do not require that the coverings to be minimal if they are smooth.

Corollary 1.2. *Let X be a smooth surface with the Kodaira dimension $\kappa(X) \geq 0$ and $\pi : X \to S$ be a ramified cyclic covering over a rational surface S with $\dim|-K_S| \geq 1$. Then for every $k \geq 3$ and ample divisor A on S, $K_X + k\pi^*A$ is very ample and normally generated.*

The corollary immediately follows from the theorem below.

Theorem 1.3. *Let S be a rational surface with $\dim|-K_S| \geq 1$. Let $\pi : X \to S$ be a ramified r-cyclic covering of S with the branch locus $\Gamma \in |rB|$ for some divisor B. Suppose one of the following conditions holds*

(1) *X is smooth and $H^0(S, \mathscr{O}_S(mK_S + lB)) \neq 0$ for some integers $m, l \geq 1$*[1].

(2) *K_X is nef (X possibly singular).*

Then for any divisor A on S with the property that $A^2 \geq 7$ and $A \cdot C \geq 3$ for any curve C on S, the divisor $K_X + \pi^*A$ is very ample and normally generated.

Note that if K_X is nef, then $K_S + (r-1)B$ is nef, and hence $H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S + (r-1)B)) \neq 0$ by the Riemann-Roch theorem.

The idea of the proof is similar to that of [RS17], that is, one needs to find an auxiliary cycle on S to deal with the potentially low positivity of B in establishing the surjectivity of the multiplication maps

$$\begin{aligned} H^0(S, \mathscr{O}_S(K_S + (k+1)B + A)) \quad &\otimes \quad H^0(S, \mathscr{O}_S(K_S + kB + A)) \\ &\to \quad H^0(S, \mathscr{O}_S(2K_S + (2k+1)B + 2A)) \end{aligned}$$

for various integer k. An ingredient in the present paper is an application of Zariski decomposition of the divisor B, which enables us to define an auxiliary rational cycle on S (see (3.1) and Theorem 2.4 for notion of rational

[1]Since $-K_S$ is effective in our setting, the condition that $H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(mK_S + lB)) \neq 0$ for some integers $l, m \geq 1$ is equivalent to the condition that $H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S + nB)) \neq 0$ for some integer $n \geq 1$. But we will keep the preceding one in the presentation, since it follows more immediately from the inequality $\kappa(X) \geq 0$.

cycle) that works in the argument for all situations except for the case when $|-K_S|$ induces an elliptic fibration of S over $\mathbb{P}^1$. The extremal case is treated separately in the end of Section 4.

In the situation of double coverings, Harbourne's vanishing theorem [Har97, Thm. 3.1] for nef divisors on anticanonical rational surfaces is extensively used in [RS17]. However in the situation of higher degree cyclic coverings, $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors appear naturally and Harbourne's vanishing unfortunately does not extend to the perturbations of nef divisors by fractional divisors with simple normal crossing support. So by contrast here we use the Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing theorem extensively, while Harbourne's vanishing is used less directly.

Conventions and notations: we work throughout over the field of complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$. All surfaces are projective and smooth unless otherwise specified. A curve on a surface means a nonzero effective divisor on the surface. We also call a cycle for a curve. Given a sheaf $\mathscr{F}$ of $\mathscr{O}_X$-modules, the notation $h^i(X, \mathscr{F})$ denotes the dimension of the cohomology group $H^i(X, \mathscr{F})$. When the context is clear, we simply write $H^i(\mathscr{F})$ for $H^i(X, \mathscr{F})$ and similarly for $h^i(\mathscr{F})$. We say a divisor class D is *effective* if $h^0(\mathscr{O}_S(D)) > 0$. We do not distinguish between a divisor and its associated line bundle. For a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D, $\lfloor D \rfloor$ ($\lceil D \rceil$ resp.) denotes the round down (round up resp.) of D, and $\{D\}$ denotes the fractional part of D.

Acknowledgments. I am grateful to Brian Harbourne, Shin-Yao Jow, Bangere Purnaprajna and Yuan Wang for very helpful discussions and communications.

2. Preliminary

Given a surface S, let K_S denote a canonical divisor of S. According to Castelnuovo, a surface S is rational if and only if $h^1(\mathscr{O}_S) = h^0(\mathscr{O}_S(2K_S)) = 0$. A rational surface S is called anticanonical if its anticanonical system $|-K_S|$ is nonempty. Examples of anticanonical rational surfaces include del Pezzo surfaces, blowing-ups of $\mathbb{F}_e$ along at most 8 points, and smooth proper toric surfaces.

We collect some facts on anticanonical rational surfaces that are needed in the subsequent sections.

2.1. **Adjoint divisors on anticanonical rational surfaces.**

First we recall two properties of adjoint divisors.

Proposition 2.1 ([RS17, Prop. 3.7])**.** *Let S be an anticanonical rational surface and A be a divisor on S with the property that $A \cdot C \geq 3$ for any curve C on S. Then $(K_S + A) \cdot (-K_S) \geq 3$ unless*

(1) $S = \mathbb{P}^2$, $A = \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(3)$,

(2) $K_S^2 = 1, A = -3K_S$.

In case (2), $-K_S$ is ample and has a unique base point.

Proposition 2.2 ([RS17, Prop. 3.8])**.** *Let S be an anticanonical rational surface and A be a divisor on S with the property that $A \cdot C \geq 3$ for any curve C on S. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) *$K_S + A$ is nef;*
(2) *$K_S + A$ is base point free;*
(3) *$A^2 \geq 7$.*

Moreover if any of the equivalent conditions holds, then $K_S + A$ is ample unless $K_S + A = 0$.

2.2. **Fixed part of the anticanonical linear system.** Anticanonical rational surfaces have many common behaviors with K3 surfaces. But for anticanonical rational surfaces, $|-K_S|$ can have a fixed part. Put

$$|-K_S| = F + |M|,$$

where F is the fixed part and M the moving part (hence is nef). What's worse, F is neither reduced nor irreducible in general, see [RS17, Ex. 3.4] for an example due to Harbourne.

In case that $\dim|-K_S| \geq 1$ and $F \neq \emptyset$, F satisfies the property that $H^1(\mathscr{O}_F) = 0$, as the following criterion implies.

Lemma 2.3. *Let S be a surface with $q = p_g = 0$. Let C be a curve on S. Then $H^1(\mathscr{O}_C) = 0$ if and only if $H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S + C)) = 0$.*

Proof. The short exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathscr{O}_S(-C) \to \mathscr{O}_S \to \mathscr{O}_C \to 0,$$

yields the exact sequence

$$H^1(\mathscr{O}_S) \to H^1(\mathscr{O}_C) \to H^2(\mathscr{O}_S(-C)) \to H^2(\mathscr{O}_S) \to 0.$$

Since $H^1(\mathscr{O}_S) = H^2(\mathscr{O}_S) = 0$, one has

$$H^1(\mathscr{O}_C) \simeq H^2(\mathscr{O}_S(-C)) \simeq H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S + C))^*,$$

by Serre duality. □

Curves on surfaces with the property $H^1(\mathscr{O}_C) = 0$ are studied by M. Artin.

Theorem 2.4 ([Art62, Thm. 1.7])**.** *Given a positive cycle $Z = \sum_{i=1}^{s} a_i Z_i$ on a surface S which is smooth at Supp(Z). The following are equivalent:*

(1) *$H^1(\mathscr{O}_Z) = 0$.*
(2) *The group homomorphism $d : H^1(\mathscr{O}_Z^*) \to \mathbb{Z}^s$ by*

$$\mathscr{L} \mapsto (\deg(\mathscr{L}|_{Z_1}), \deg(\mathscr{L}|_{Z_2}), \cdots, \deg(\mathscr{L}|_{Z_s}))$$

is an isomorphism.

(3) *For every positive cycle $Y \leq Z$, the arithmetic genus $p_a(Y) \leq 0$.*

Note that the theorem above implies that if $H^1(\mathscr{O}_Z) = 0$, then for every positive cycle $Y \leq Z$, $H^1(\mathscr{O}_Y) = 0$. In particular, each irreducible component of Z is a smooth rational curve. This is also obvious in the special case when $q = p_g = 0$ in view of Lemma 2.3. Following [Art62], we define

Definition 2.5. Let C be a curve on a surface S. C is called a *rational cycle* if $H^1(C, \mathscr{O}_C) = 0$.

Corollary 2.6. *Let Z be a rational cycle. Then for any two distinct components C, C' of Z, the intersection number $C \cdot C' \leq 1$.*

Proof. Since $C + C'$ is a sub-cycle of Z, by Theorem 2.4, $p_a(C + C') \leq 0$, and hence $(C + C' + K_S) \cdot (C + C') \leq -2$. The assertion follows using the fact that C and C' are smooth rational curves. □

Proposition 2.7. *Suppose* $\dim |-K_S| \geq 1$ *and* $F \neq \emptyset$. *Then*

$$M \cdot F = 2h^0(\mathscr{O}_F) \quad \textit{and} \quad h^0(\mathscr{O}_M) = h^0(\mathscr{O}_F).$$

Proof. Since $\dim |-K_S| \geq 1$, one has that $M \neq 0$. The exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathscr{O}_S(-F) \to \mathscr{O}_S \to \mathscr{O}_F \to 0$$

yields

$$\begin{aligned} h^0(\mathscr{O}_F) &= 1 + h^1(\mathscr{O}_S(-F)) \\ &= 1 - \chi(\mathscr{O}_S(-F)) \qquad \text{note } h^0(\mathscr{O}_S(-F)) = h^2(\mathscr{O}_S(-F)) = 0 \\ &= -\frac{(-F) \cdot (-F - K_S)}{2} \\ &= \frac{M \cdot F}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives the first assertion that $M \cdot F = 2h^0(\mathscr{O}_F)$. For the second, consider the exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathscr{O}_S(-M) \to \mathscr{O}_S \to \mathscr{O}_M \to 0.$$

Using the above result, we get that

$$h^0(\mathscr{O}_M) = 1 + h^1(\mathscr{O}_S(-M)) = 1 + h^1(\mathscr{O}_S(-F)) = h^0(\mathscr{O}_F),$$

where the second identity is by Serre duality. This finishes the proof. □

Since $M \cdot (-K_S) \geq M \cdot F \geq 2$ by Proposition 2.7, we deduce that M is base point free and all higher cohomology vanishes by [Har97, Thm 3.1]. We put $s := h^0(\mathscr{O}_F) = h^0(\mathscr{O}_M)$. A general member in $|M|$ can be written as $\sum_{i=1}^{s} M_i$, where M_i are smooth irreducible curve. Since $M_i^2 = M_i \cdot M \geq 0$ for all i, by Hodge index theorem, there are two possibilities:

(1) $s > 1$, $M_i^2 = 0$ for all i.

(2) $s = 1$, $M_1^2 \geq 0$.

By the same argument as in Proposition 2.7, we can get that

$$\frac{F \cdot M_i}{2} = h^0(\mathscr{O}_{F+\sum_{j\neq i} M_j}) \geq 1.$$

But by Lemma 2.7, $F \cdot M = 2s$, so $F \cdot M_i = 2$, for each i. In either case, $M_i \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$.

2.3. **Multiplication maps of line bundles.** For regular varieties, sometimes one can reduce the surjectivity of considered multiplication maps of line bundles to the surjectivity of multiplication maps on a hypersurface, as the following lemma shows.

Lemma 2.8 ([GP99, p. 154])**.** *Let X be a smooth variety with $H^1(\mathscr{O}_X) = 0$. Let E be a vector bundle and $L \simeq \mathscr{O}_X(D)$ be a base point free line bundle with the property that $H^1(E \otimes L^{-1}) = 0$. If the natural map $H^0(E|_D) \otimes H^0(L|_D) \to H^0(E \otimes L|_D)$ is surjective, then so is the natural map $H^0(E) \otimes H^0(L) \to H^0(E \otimes L)$.* □

We give a criterion for the surjectivity of multiplication maps on anticanonical rational surfaces in the following lemma, which is a strengthening of [RS17, Lemma 5.5]. Here we remove the assumption that B' is effective, making it more flexible in applications. For the reader's convenience, we give a sketch of its proof, while details can be found in [RS17, pp. 262-263].

Lemma 2.9. *Let S be an anticanonical rational surface and L be a divisor on S such that $|K_S + L|$ contains a nonsingular curve. Let B' be a divisor on S with the property that $H^1(B') = 0$. Suppose $(K_S + L) \cdot (-2K_S + B') \geq 5$ and $(K_S + L) \cdot (-K_S + B') \geq 2$. Then the natural map*

$$H^0(K_S + L + B') \otimes H^0(K_S + L) \to H^0(2K_S + 2L + B')$$

is surjective.

Sketch of the Proof. Since $H^1(B') = 0$, by Lemma 2.8, the problem can be reduced to the surjectivity of

$$H^0((K_S + L + B')|_\Delta) \otimes H^0((K_S + L)|_\Delta) \to H^0((2K_S + 2L + B')|_\Delta),$$

where $\Delta \in |K_S + L|$ is a nonsingular curve.

To apply Green's H^0-lemma [Gre84], we shall establish the inequality

$$h^1(B'|_\Delta) \leq h^0((K_S + L)|_\Delta) - 2. \tag{2.1}$$

By Riemann-Roch, $h^0((K_S + L)|_\Delta) \geq (K_S + L)^2 + 1 - g(\Delta)$, where $g(\Delta)$ is the genus of Δ. On the other hand, $h^1(B'|_\Delta) = h^0((\Delta + K_S - B')|_\Delta)$ by duality. For an upper bound of $h^0((\Delta + K_S - B')|_\Delta)$, we discuss by cases.

(i) If $\deg(\Delta + K_S - B')|_\Delta \leq \deg K_\Delta$, this is treated in [RS17] and the assumption that $(K_S + L) \cdot (-2K_S + B') \geq 5$ is utilized.

(ii) If $\deg(\Delta + K_S - B')|_\Delta > \deg K_\Delta$, then

$$h^0((\Delta+K_S-B')|_\Delta) = \chi((\Delta+K_S-B')|_\Delta) = (2K_S+L-B')\cdot(K_S+L)+1-g(\Delta).$$

Therefore

$$(h^0((K_S+L)|_\Delta)-2) - h^1(B'|_\Delta) \geq (K_S+L)\cdot(-K_S+B') \geq 0$$

by the assumption. So (2.1) holds, and this completes the proof. □

For any curve C on an anticanonical surface with $H^1(\mathscr{O}_C) = 0$, we have the following criterion for surjectivity of multiplication maps over C.

Lemma 2.10. *Let S be a surface and C a curve with $h^1(\mathscr{O}_C) = 0$. Put $C = \sum a_i\Gamma_i$, where Γ_i are irreducible components of C. Let L_1, L_2 be two line bundles on S such that $L_1\cdot\Gamma_i > 0, L_2\cdot\Gamma_i \geq 0$ for every i. Suppose that $H^1(L_2(-\Gamma_i)) = 0$ for every i. Then the natural map*

$$H^0(L_1|_C)\otimes H^0(L_2) \to H^0((L_1+L_2)|_C)$$

is surjective.

Proof. The assumption on L_2 is slightly different from the one in [RS17, Lemma 5.2], but the proof is exactly the same. Note that if L_2 is ample and base point free and if $-K_S-\Gamma_i$ is effective, then $H^1(L_2(-\Gamma_i)) = 0$ by [RS17, Lemma 5.1]. □

3. Construction of rational cycles, properties of adjoint divisors

We start by fixing some notations. Throughout this section, let $r \geq 2$ be an integer and let $\pi : X \to S$ be a ramified r-cyclic covering (possibly singular) over an anticanonical rational S with the branch locus $\Gamma \in |\mathscr{O}_S(rB)|$ for some integral divisor B. Then $K_X = \pi^*(K_S + (r-1)B)$ and $\pi_*\mathscr{O}_X \simeq \oplus_{i=0}^{r-1}\mathscr{O}_S(-iB)$ as $\mathscr{O}_S$-modules. Let A be a fixed divisor on S satisfying that $A^2 \geq 7$ and $A\cdot C \geq 3$ for any curve C on S.

Since B is a pseudoeffective integral divisor, we have the Zariski decomposition of B as a summation of $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors

$$B = P + N,$$

with the property that

(i) P is nef;
(ii) $N = \sum_{i=1}^s a_iE_i$ is effective. If $N \neq 0$, then the intersection matrix $\|(E_i\cdot E_j)\|$ is negative definite;
(iii) For each $1 \leq i \leq s$, the intersection number $P\cdot E_i = 0$.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose $H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(mK_S + lB)) \neq 0$ for some integers $l, m \geq 1$. Then $P \neq 0$. More generally P is not numerically trivial.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that $P = 0$, then $N = B$ is integral. By [Laz04a, Prop. 2.3.21], the natural map

$$H^0(S, \mathscr{O}_S) \simeq H^0(S, \mathscr{O}_S(mB - \lceil mN \rceil)) \to H^0(S, \mathscr{O}_S(mB))$$

is bijective for any $m \geq 1$. Since $mK_S + lB$ is effective, we have

$$h^0(\mathscr{O}_S(lB)) = h^0(\mathscr{O}_S((mK_S + lB) + m(-K_S))) \geq h^0(\mathscr{O}_S(-K_S)) \geq 2.$$

This gives a contradiction. Thus $P \neq 0$.

Take a positive integer k such that kP is integral. Since S is anticanonical, $H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(kP)) \neq 0$. Note that $\mathscr{O}_S(kP) \ncong \mathscr{O}_S$, for otherwise $P = 0$. Therefore P cannot be numerically trivial. □

We define a cycle depending on both $|-K_S|$ and B

$$Z = F + \lfloor N \rfloor. \tag{3.1}$$

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose* $|-K_S|$ *has the fixed part* F *and* $\dim|-K_S| \geq 1$. *Assume that* B *satisfies that* $H^0(mK_S + lB) \neq 0$ *for some integers* $l, m \geq 1$. *Then*

$$H^1(\mathscr{O}_S(B - Z)) = 0.$$

Proof. We have the identity for $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors

$$B - (F + \lfloor N \rfloor) = K_S + (P + M) + \{N\}.$$

We claim that $M \cdot P > 0$. Suppose to the contrary that $M \cdot P = 0$, then since P and M are nef and thanks to Lemma 3.1, they are not numerically trivial, and hence the Hodge index theorem implies that $M = cP$ for some $c \in \mathbb{Q}_+$ and $M^2 = 0$, from which it follows that

$$(mK_S + lB) \cdot M = mK_S \cdot M = -mF \cdot M < 0,$$

contradicting to the assumption. Therefore $(M + P)^2 > 0$, and hence $P + M$ is a nef and big $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor. Then Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing[2] (cf. for instance [Laz04b, 9.1.18]) applies. □

Proposition 3.3. *With the same assumption as in Proposition 3.2. Then*

$$H^1(Z, \mathscr{O}_Z) = 0.$$

Proof. Since

$$(K_S + F + \lfloor N \rfloor) \cdot P = -M \cdot P < 0,$$

as the proof of Proposition 3.2 has shown, we have $H^0(K_S + F + \lfloor N \rfloor) = 0$. So the assertion follows from Lemma 2.3. □

Remark 3.4. From the proof, it is clear that for any positive integer k, it holds that $H^1(\mathscr{O}_{F+\lfloor kN \rfloor}) = 0$.

[2]On surfaces, simple normal crossing condition for the fractional part $\{N\}$ is not needed.

Next we study the positivity of $K_S + kB + A$, which will be needed in the next section.

Proposition 3.5. *Suppose one of the following conditions holds:*

(1) *X is smooth.*
(2) *$K_S + (r-1)B$ is nef.*

Then for any $0 < k \leq r-1$,

(i) *the divisor $K_S + kB + A$ is very ample and normally generated.*
(ii) *$(K_S + kB + A)^2 > 1$, unless $(S, A, B, k) = (\mathbb{P}^2, \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(3), \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1), 1)$.*

Proof. If $S = \mathbb{P}^2$, the assertion is trivial. So we assume $S \neq \mathbb{P}^2$.

(1) Suppose X is smooth. By the assumption on A and [Rei88, Thm. 1], we deduce that $K_X + \pi^*A$ is very ample, so $K_S + (r-1)B + A$ is ample, as π is finite. In view of Proposition 2.2, for any $0 < k \leq r-1$,

$$K_S + kB + A = \frac{r-1-k}{r-1}(K_S + A) + \frac{k}{r-1}(K_S + (r-1)B + A) \tag{3.2}$$

is ample. One has

$$\begin{aligned} & (K_S + kB + A) \cdot (-K_S) \\ \geq\ & \frac{r-1-k}{r-1}(K_S + A) \cdot (-K_S) + \frac{k}{r-1}(K_S + (r-1)B + A) \cdot (-K_S). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$(K_S + (r-1)B + A) \cdot (-K_S) \geq 2.$$

In fact, if $|-K_S|$ has a fixed part F, then

$$(K_S + (r-1)B + A) \cdot (-K_S) = (K_S + (r-1)B + A) \cdot (M + F) \geq 2;$$

otherwise $-K_S$ is nef, so

$$(K_S + (r-1)B + A) \cdot (-K_S) \geq (K_S + A) \cdot (-K_S) \geq 2,$$

by Proposition 2.1.

Moreover when $(K_S + A) \cdot (-K_S) = 2$, we have that $K_S^2 = 1, A = -3K_S$, and hence

$$(K_S + (r-1)B + A) \cdot (-K_S) = 2 + (r-1)B \cdot (-K_S) \geq 3.$$

Therefore $(K_S + kB + A) \cdot (-K_S) > 2$. Then the assertion follows from [Har97, Thm. III.1] and [GP01, Thm. 1.3, Prop. 1.22].

Suppose to the contrary that $(K_S + kB + A)^2 = 1$. From (3.2), we see that

$$(K_S + A)^2 = (K_S + (r-1)B + A)^2 = 1.$$

This is impossible, because

$$(K_S + (r-1)B + A)^2 - (K_S + A)^2 = (r-1)(K_S + (r-1)B + A + K_S + A) \cdot B > 0.$$

(2) Next assume that $K_S + (r-1)B$ is nef. Since

$$K_S + kB + A = \frac{k}{r-1}(K_S + (r-1)B) + \frac{r-1-k}{r-1}(K_S + A) + \frac{k}{r-1}A,$$

we get that $K_S + kB + A$ is ample. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & (K_S + kB + A) \cdot (-K_S) \\ \geq\ & \frac{r-1-k}{r-1}(K_S + A) \cdot (-K_S) + \frac{k}{r-1}A \cdot (-K_S) \\ \geq\ & 2\left(\frac{r-1-k}{r-1}\right) + 3\left(\frac{k}{r-1}\right) \qquad \text{by Proposition 2.1} \\ >\ & 2. \end{aligned}$$

Then by [Har97, Thm. III.1] and [GP01, Thm. 1.3, Prop. 1.22], $K_S + kB + A$ is very ample and normally generated.

Lastly,

$$\begin{aligned} & (K_S + kB + A)^2 \\ \geq\ & \left(\frac{r-1-k}{r-1}\right)^2 (K_S + A)^2 + 2\left(\frac{r-1-k}{r-1}\right)\left(\frac{k}{r-1}\right)(K_S + A) \cdot A + \left(\frac{k}{r-1}\right)^2 A^2 \\ \geq\ & \left(\frac{r-1-k}{r-1}\right)^2 + 2\left(\frac{r-1-k}{r-1}\right)\left(\frac{k}{r-1}\right) + 7\left(\frac{k}{r-1}\right)^2 \\ =\ & 1 + 6\left(\frac{k}{r-1}\right)^2 \\ >\ & 1. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose that L is an ample divisor on S with $L^2 > 1$. Then*

$$L \cdot (-K_S + B - Z) \geq 2 \qquad \text{and} \qquad L \cdot (-2K_S + B - Z) \geq 5.$$

Proof. Since

$$(-K_S + B - Z) \cdot L = (P + M + \{N\}) \cdot L \geq (P + M) \cdot L > 1,$$

we get $(-K_S + B - Z_r) \cdot L \geq 2$. Obviously,

$$(-2K_S + B - Z) \cdot L \geq (P + F + 2M) \cdot L > 3.$$

If $L \cdot (-2K_S + B - Z) = 4$, then $L \cdot F = L \cdot M = 1$, this implies that F is integral and so is every member of $|M|$. We claim that $M^2 > 0$. For otherwise, $|M| : S \to \mathbb{P}^1$ is a rational ruled surface with invariant $e \geq 3$. Then computation shows that $M^2 = e + 4 > 0$, a contradiction. Then the Hodge index theorem forces that $L^2 = M^2 = 1$, contradicting the assumption that $L^2 > 1$. Therefore $L \cdot (-2K_S + B - Z) \geq 5$. □

The following result will be needed in the next section for applying Lemma 2.10.

Proposition 3.7. *For any $E \subseteq SuppZ$, we have the vanishing*

$$H^1(S, \mathscr{O}_S(K_S + kB + A - E)) = 0.$$

Proof. In view of Proposition 3.5, $\mathscr{O}_S(K_S + kB + A)$ is very ample; so according to [RS17, Lemma 15], if $-K_S - E$ is effective, then the vanishing holds. We will henceforth assume $E \subseteq \mathrm{Supp}\lfloor N \rfloor$.

Put $\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{O}_S(K_S + kB + A - E)$. We will take a rational cycle C such that $H^1(\mathscr{L}(-C)) = 0$ and $\mathscr{L}$ intersects each component of C nonnegatively, and hence $H^1(\mathscr{L}|_C) = 0$ by [Har96, Lemma 7]. Then the vanishing of $H^1(\mathscr{L})$ will follow from the exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathscr{L}(-C) \to \mathscr{L} \to \mathscr{L}|_C \to 0.$$

To this end, it suffices to take $C = \lfloor kN \rfloor - E$, which is rational (cf. Remark 3.4). Since

$$K_S + kB + A - E - C = K_S + (kP + A) + \{kN\},$$

by Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing, $H^1(\mathscr{L}(-C)) = 0$ holds. On the other hand, for each component Γ of $\lfloor kN \rfloor$, $E \cdot \Gamma \leq 1$ by Corollary 2.6. Therefore

$$(K_S + kB + A - E) \cdot \Gamma \geq 0.$$

This completes the proof. □

Remark 3.8. A simple calculation shows that if $-K_S - E$ is not effective, then $E^2 = -1, E \cdot M = 1, E \cdot F = 0$, and $\dim |-K_S| = 1$, which is a situation we cannot rule out.

4. Proof of Theorem 1.3

Keep the notations as in Section 3.

Proof. Note to begin with that $K_X + \pi^* A = \pi^*(K_S + (r-1)B + A)$ is ample and base point free, thanks to Proposition 3.5 (i) and the finiteness of π. Therefore the very ampleness of $K_X + \pi^* A$ will be a consequence of normal generation by [Mum70, p. 38] (In case X is smooth, very ampleness also follows from Reider's criterion [Rei88]).

To prove the normal generation, we shall show that the natural map

(4.1)
$$H^0(\mathscr{O}_S\,(k(K_X + \pi^* A))) \otimes H^0(\mathscr{O}_S\,(K_X + \pi^* A)) \to H^0(\mathscr{O}_S\,((k+1)(K_X + \pi^* A)))$$

surjects for all $k \geq 1$.

For $k \geq 3$, the surjectivity of (4.1) simply follows from Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity property. In fact, for $i = 1, 2$, we have

$$H^i(\mathscr{O}_S\,((k-i)(K_X + \pi^* A)))$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\simeq \bigoplus_{j=0}^{r-1} H^i(\mathscr{O}_S((k-i)(K_S+(r-1)B+A)-jB)) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

by Proposition 3.5 and [Har97, Thm III.1]. So it remains to treat the cases $k = 1, 2$. We only treat the case $k = 1$, since the case $k = 2$ is analogous and easier.

Pushing down (4.1) to S, it is sufficient to show the surjectivity of

$$H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S+kB+A))\otimes H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S+kB+A)) \xrightarrow{f_1} H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(2K_S+2kB+2A)),$$

and

$$H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S+(k+1)B+A))\otimes H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S+kB+A)) \xrightarrow{f_2} H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(2K_S+(2k+1)B+2A)),$$

for all $\left\lfloor \frac{r-2}{2} \right\rfloor \le k \le r-2$.

According to Proposition 3.5, f_1 is surjective. For f_2, we will take a curve C on S (to be specified later) that makes rows in the commutative diagram exact

(4.2)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S+(k+1)B+A-C)) & & H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S+(k+1)B+A)) & & H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S+(k+1)B+A)|_C) \\ \otimes & \hookrightarrow & \otimes & \twoheadrightarrow & \otimes \\ H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S+kB+A)) & & H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S+kB+A)) & & H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S+kB+A)) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \alpha} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f_2} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \beta} \\ H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(2K_S+(2k+1)B+A-C)) & \hookrightarrow & H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(2K_S+(2k+1)B+A)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(2K_S+(2k+1)B+A)|_C). \end{array}$$

Then by the snake lemma, the surjectivity of f_2 will follow from the surjectivity of the column maps α and β.

If $S = \mathbb{P}^2$, then f_2 is clearly surjective. We assume henceforth that $S \neq \mathbb{P}^2$. There are three cases:

Case I: $-K_S$ has the fixed part.

Put $|-K_S| = F + |M|$. In this case we can take $C = Z$, as in (3.1), and put $B' = B - C$. Since

$$K_S + kB + A + B' \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_S + (K_S + kB + A) + (P + M) + \{N\},$$

Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing implies that $H^1(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S + kB + A + B')) = 0$, and hence the top row of commutative diagram (4.2) is exact.

It has been shown that $H^1(\mathscr{O}_S(B')) = 0$ in Proposition 3.2. And by Lemma 3.6 and Proposition 3.5(ii), we have $(K_S + kB + A)\cdot(-K_S + B') \ge 2$ and $(K_S + kB + A)\cdot(-2K_S + B') \ge 5$. Applying Lemma 2.9, we deduce that α is surjective.

For the surjectivity of β, we will apply Lemma 2.10. Since $H^1(\mathscr{O}_C) = 0$ by Proposition 3.3 and since for each component Γ_i of C, $H^1(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S + kB +$

$A - \Gamma_i)) = 0$ by Proposition 3.7, we can apply Lemma 2.10 by setting $L_1 = \mathscr{O}_S(K_S + (k+1)B + A)$ and $L_2 = \mathscr{O}_S(K_S + kB + A)$.

Case II: $-K_S$ has no fixed part and $K_S^2 > 0$.

In this case, $-K_S$ is big and nef. We take $C = \lfloor N \rfloor$. Since

$$B' = B - C \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_S + (-K_S + P) + \{N\},$$

it follows that $H^1(\mathscr{O}_S(B')) = 0$ by Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing. Moreover by Proposition 2.1, we see

$$(K_S + kB + A) \cdot (-K_S) = (K_S + A) \cdot (-K_S) + kB \cdot (-K_S) \geq 3.$$

Since B' is pseudoeffective, the conditions in Lemma 2.9 hold in this setting. The surjectivity of β also follows from Lemma 2.10 in a similar fashion.

Case III: $-K_S$ has no fixed part and $K_S^2 = 0$.

In this case, $-K_S$ is nef, and hence base point free. We have an elliptic fibration $\pi : S \xrightarrow{|-K_S|} \mathbb{P}^1$ with connected fibres. Note that π has (finitely many) singular fibers, because $\chi_{\text{top}}(S) = 12 \neq 0$. Also note that $(K_S + A) \cdot (-K_S) \geq 3$ by Proposition 2.1.

If $H^1(\mathscr{O}_S(B - \lfloor N \rfloor)) = 0$, we take $C = \lfloor N \rfloor$. Then as in Case II, we are done. Therefore we assume that $H^1(\mathscr{O}_S(B - \lfloor N \rfloor)) \neq 0$. This implies that

$$P \cdot (-K_S) = P^2 = 0.$$

We deduce from the Hodge index theorem that $P = c(-K_S)$ for some rational number $c > 0$ (cf. Lemma 3.1). Let $E \in |-K_S|$ be a general fibre of π, we have that

$$\deg(\mathscr{O}_S(B)|_E) = B \cdot (-K_S) = (P + N) \cdot (-K_S) = 0.$$

We discuss by cases:

(i) $\mathscr{O}_S(B)|_E$ is a torsion line bundle.

In this subcase, we take $C = \lfloor N \rfloor + (1 + \lfloor c \rfloor)E$. Then

$$B' := B - C \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_S + \{c\}E + \{N\}.$$

For the surjectivity of α, we shall first show $H^1(\mathscr{O}_S(B')) = 0$. Let $U \subset \mathbb{P}^1$ be the open subset, over which π is smooth. For each closed point $t \in U$, denote by S_t the fibre over t. Since $\mathscr{O}_S(B')|_E \simeq \mathscr{O}_S(B)|_E$ is a nontrivial torsion line bundle, thus

$$h^0(\mathscr{O}_S(B')|_{S_t}) = h^1(\mathscr{O}_S(B')|_{S_t}) = 0.$$

Then by Grauert theorem [Har77, III 12.9], $R^i\pi_*\mathscr{O}_S(B')|_U = 0$, for each $i \geq 0$. Thanks to the torsion freeness of the direct images $R^i\pi_*\mathscr{O}_S(B')$, see for instance [dFEM14, Thm 2.86], we have that $R^i\pi_*\mathscr{O}_S(B') = 0$ for each i. By the Leray spectral sequence $E_2^{i,j} := H^j(\mathbb{P}^1, R^i\pi_*\mathscr{O}_S(B')) \Rightarrow H^{i+j}(S, \mathscr{O}_S(B'))$, we obtain that $H^1(\mathscr{O}_S(B')) = 0$.

Surjective of α follows from Lemma 2.9. For the surjectivity of β, we apply Lemma 2.10 for $\lfloor N \rfloor$ and [RS17, Prop. 5.4] for $(1+\lfloor c \rfloor)E$ respectively.

(ii) $\mathscr{O}_S(B)|_E \simeq \mathscr{O}_E$.

In this subcase, with a similar argument as in (i), we see $\pi_*(\mathscr{O}_S(B)) \simeq \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-m)$ is a line bundle for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore by projection formula, $\pi_*(\mathscr{O}_S(B - mK_S)) \simeq \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}$. The nonzero natural morphism

$$\mathscr{O}_S \simeq \pi^*\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1} \simeq \pi^*\pi_*(\mathscr{O}_S(B - mK_S)) \to \mathscr{O}_S(B - mK_S)$$

gives rises to a nonzero section $s \in \Gamma(S, \mathscr{O}_S(B - mK_S))$, whose zero locus $(s)_0 = \sum a_i\Gamma_i$, where $a_i \geq 0$ are integers and Γ_i are irreducible curves. So we have the linear equivalence

$$B \sim mK_S + \sum a_i\Gamma_i.$$

Since $\Gamma_i \cdot (-K_S) = 0$ and $h^0(\mathscr{O}_S(\Gamma_i)) = 1$, we deduce that Γ_i is contained in some reducible singular fibres. By Lemma 2.3, $\Gamma_i \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$. Next we shall show $m < 0$.

Claim A: $\sum a_i\Gamma_i$ is a rational cycle.

Proof of Claim A. From above, we know that

$$(B - mK_S) + K_S \sim K_S + \sum a_i\Gamma_i.$$

If $h^0(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S + \sum a_i\Gamma_i)) > 0$, then $h^0(\mathscr{O}_S(B - mK_S)) \geq h^0(\mathscr{O}_S(-K_S)) \geq 2$. This contradicts the choice of m such that $\pi_*(\mathscr{O}_S(B - mK_S)) \simeq \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}$. Therefore $H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S + \sum a_i\Gamma_i)) = 0$, and the assertion follows from Lemma 2.3. □

Claim B: $h^0(\mathscr{O}_S(l\sum a_i\Gamma_i)) = 1$ for any integer $l \geq 1$.

Proof of Claim B. Put $\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{O}_S(\sum a_i\Gamma_i)$ and $D = \sum a_i\Gamma_i$. We first show that $h^0(S, \mathscr{L}^l) = 1$ for all $l \geq 1$ by induction. Suppose $h^0(\mathscr{L}^l) = 1$ for some $l \geq 1$. The exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathscr{O}_S \to \mathscr{O}_S(D) \to \mathscr{O}_D(D) \to 0$$

yields the exact sequence

$$H^1(S, \mathscr{L}^l) \to H^1(S, \mathscr{L}^{l+1}) \to H^1(\mathscr{L}^{l+1}|_D).$$

Since the intersection $\mathscr{L}$ with each component Γ_i is zero and D is a rational cycle by Claim A, it follows that $H^1(\mathscr{L}^{l+1}|_D) = 0$ by a result of Harbourne [Har96, Lemma 7]. Then by the induction hypothesis, we have $H^1(S, \mathscr{L}^{l+1}) = 0$.

Next clearly $h^2(\mathscr{L}^l) = 0$, so the Riemann-Roch theorem implies that

$$h^0(\mathscr{L}^l) = \chi(\mathscr{L}^l) = \frac{(lD)(lD - K_S)}{2} + 1 = 1.$$

This completes the proof of Claim B. □

By the assumption of the theorem, for $l \gg 0$,

$$K_S + lB \sim (lm+1)K_S + l\sum a_i\Gamma_i$$

is effective. But if $m \geq 0$, then

$$H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(K_S + lB)) \simeq H^0(\mathscr{O}_S(l\sum a_i\Gamma_i - (lm+1)E)) = 0,$$

because the linear system $|l\sum a_i\Gamma_i|$ does not move according to Claim B. This shows that $m < 0$.

Finally we take $C = (-m)E + \sum a_i\Gamma_i$. It follows that

$$H^1(\mathscr{O}_S(B - C)) \simeq H^1(\mathscr{O}_S) = 0.$$

Surjective of α follows from Lemma 2.9. And for the surjectivity of β, we apply Lemma 2.10 for $(-m)E$ and [RS17, Prop. 5.4] for $\sum a_i\Gamma_i$ respectively. □

References

[Art62] Michael Artin. Some numerical criteria for contractability of curves on algebraic surfaces. *American Journal of Mathematics*, pages 485–496, 1962.

[dFEM14] Tommaso de Fernex, Lawrence Ein, and Mircea Mustata. *Vanishing theorems and singularities in birational geometry*. available at: http://homepages.math.uic.edu/ ein/DFEM.pdf, 2014.

[GP99] Francisco J. Gallego and Bangere P. Purnaprajna. Projective normality and syzygies of algebraic surfaces. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 1999(506):145–180, 1999.

[GP01] Francisco J. Gallego and Bangere P. Purnaprajna. Some results on rational surfaces and Fano varieties. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 538:25–55, 2001.

[Gre84] Mark Green. Koszul cohomology and the geometry of projective varieties. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 19(1):125–171, 1984.

[Har77] Robin Hartshorne. *Algebraic geometry*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977.

[Har96] Brian Harbourne. Rational surfaces with $K^2 > 0$. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 124(3):727–733, 1996.

[Har97] Brian Harbourne. Anticanonical rational surfaces. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 349(3):1191–1208, 1997.

[Hor76] Eiji Horikawa. Algebraic surfaces of general type with small c_1^2, I. *Annals of Mathematics*, 104(2):357–387, 1976.

[Laz04a] Robert Lazarsfeld. *Positivity in algebraic geometry I: Classical setting: line bundles and linear series*, volume 48. Springer, 2004.

[Laz04b] Robert Lazarsfeld. *Positivity in algebraic geometry II: Positivity for vector bundles, and multiplier ideals*, volume 48. Springer, 2004.

[Mum70] David Mumford. Varieties defined by quadratic equations. In *Questions on Algebraic Varieties (C.I.M.E., III Ciclo, Varenna, 1969)*, pages 29–100. Edizioni Cremonese, Rome, 1970.

[Rei88] Igor Reider. Vector bundles of rank 2 and linear systems on algebraic surfaces. *Annals of Mathematics*, 127(2):309–316, 1988.

[RS17] Biswajit Rajaguru and Lei Song. On the projective normality of double coverings over a rational surface. *Journal of Algebra*, 469:251–266, 2017.

Department of Mathematics, University of Kansas, 1460 Jayhawk Blvd., Lawrence, KS 66045
E-mail address: lsong@ku.edu